

RECEIVED

2       NOV 16 1999       MS. POGUE: My name is Stacey Pogue. I'm  
3       with the Colorado Public Interest Research Group. We  
4       are a state-based consumer and environmental watchdog  
5       group with over 12,000 members statewide.

6                       I'm going to read my testimony. Nuclear  
7       waste is the deadliest substance known to humans. A  
8       few seconds' exposure to an irradiated fuel rod can  
9       cause cancer, and a few minutes can cause death.

10                      Common sense dictates we treat this  
11       material with utmost caution to protect people. [Any  
12       decision regarding radioactive waste must be based on  
13       sound science and protecting the public.

14                      Instead, nuclear waste policy in this  
15       country has been driven by the arrogance and greed of  
16       the nuclear industries and reckless legislation  
17       promoted by industrial outlets.

18                      Political expediencies have replaced  
19       responsible stewardship and sound science, and decision  
20       making is thrown out the window of the nuclear  
21       industry.

22                      COPIRG is disappointed the Department of  
23       Energy has chosen to continue the trend as evidenced by  
24       its refusal to follow its own guidelines, and  
25       disqualify Yucca Mountain, while simultaneously seeking

1  
continued

1 to weaken the guidelines in this draft EIS.]

2

2 [ The draft EIS is an expensive rubber stamp  
3 for the Yucca Mountain waste dump. This is not the  
4 careful, conservative analysis of safety and  
5 environmental issues required by public agencies.  
6 We believe the premise of the draft EIS is fraught with  
7 the concept of building a nuclear storage facility.  
8 This draft EIS is premature since it does not analyze  
9 actual design.

10 Only two other options are examined in  
11 this draft EIS, and they are both unrealistic, and  
12 therefore can't provide reasonable comparisons.]

3

13 COPIRG also believes the EIS downplays  
14 important and relative -- relevant scientific data. [In  
15 its rush to win approval of the Yucca Mountain dump,  
16 DOE downplays or ignores important data about rainwater  
17 and groundwater in contaminant transport. For example,  
18 the DOE claims the data on chlorine 36 are incomplete,  
19 yet a study on this issue was published in September  
20 1997.]

4

21 In addition, [we feel the draft EIS does  
22 not analyze specific transport routes. It does not  
23 consider actual or likely transport routes, which means  
24 they draw broad conclusions about overall health  
25 threats, or disproportional impact on low income or

1 minority communities with no actual data for  
2 comparisons.]

3 [The transport accident analysis is  
4 unclear. It is impossible to assess the draft EIS  
5 basis for impacts of transportation accidents based on  
6 the vague descriptions in the report and appendices.]

7 [In addition, there's concern about the  
8 transport of the waste through Colorado to Yucca  
9 Mountain considering that the information I got there's  
10 over 2,000 casks of radioactive waste will be shipped  
11 through the state. The draft EIS does not adequately  
12 address the transportation routes and the hazards in  
13 possible accidents.]

14 In conclusion, the DOE currently spends  
15 billions of dollars every year in an effort to protect  
16 the public from radioactive waste dumps as a result of  
17 weapons production. The technical difficulties are  
18 nearly insurmountable. In some places millions of  
19 dollars are spent merely monitoring the spread of  
20 radiation.

6 21 [With 95 percent of the radioactivity  
22 coming from commercial waste, the DOE should reject the  
23 Yucca Mountain site, and work to develop nuclear waste  
24 solutions based on sound science and protecting the  
25 public health instead of nuclear industry's profits.]